DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 042 CS 007 976

AUTHOR Baumann, James F.
TITLE The Direct Instruction of Reading Comprehension Skills: A Teacher-Directiveness Paradigm.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basal Reading; Beginning Reading; Elementary Education; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Instruction; Reading Strategies; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Direct Instruction

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to present a direct instructional strategy, which is based upon what is known about effective classroom instruction. After defining direct instruction in reading, research that discriminates effective teachers from less effective teachers is presented. The paper then discusses the five-step, teacher directiveness instructional paradigm, which is based upon this teacher effectiveness research. Finally, it focuses on several experimental studies validating this direct instruction approach. The paper concludes that a teacher-directiveness approach to instruction is more effective in teaching selected reading comprehension skills than is basal reader instruction. The report concludes with a five page list of references. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organizatio originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily repre ent official NIE position or policy.

ED257042

The Direct Instruction of Reading Comprehension Skills: A Teacher-Directiveness Paradigm

James F. Baumann

Purdue University

Paper presented at the annual
Meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, Chicago, April 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James F. Baumann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS007976

The Direct Instruction of Reading Comprehension Skills: A Teacher-Directiveness Paradigm[1]

> Across a large number of studies, investigators have found that (1) students who receive much of their instruction from the teacher do better than those expected to learn on their own or from each other and (2) students learn to read most efficiently when teachers use systematic instruction, monitor student responses, and give students feedback about their performance.
>
> (Rosenshine & Stevens, 1984, p. 746)

Millions of federal and private dollars and years of effort by educational researchers have resulted in research findings that demonstrate the seemingly simple-minded notion that students learn what they are taught. That is, what teachers directly teach to students, students learn; what students are not taught, they do not learn. This is true for teaching students science, mathematics, language, spelling, and a variety of reading abilities. You might ask yourself why so much time, money, and effort have been expended in proving the obvious, the common sense. Indeed, that is a reasonable question, but unfortunately, observations of teachers in classrooms (e.g., Durkin, 1978-79) indicate that much of what occurs in schools is not directly instructional; that is, oftentimes, students are not taught directly. Instead, students are engaged in extended assessment and practice activities. As Berliner (1981) stated, "The research community has validated some commonsense notions about education [i.e., students learn what they are taught]. But common sense is not common practice, as a visit to the schools will reveal" (p. 224).

The purpose of this paper is to present a direct instruction strategy for teaching students to comprehend main ideas. The strategy is based upon what is known about effective classroom instruction. After defining direct instruction, research that discriminates effective teachers from less effective teachers is presented. Then the five-step, teacher-directiveness instructional paradigm, which is based upon this teacher effectiveness research, is presented. Finally, several experimental studies validating this direct instruction approach are described and discussed.

---

[1] Portions of this paper are adapted from: Baumann, J. F., (1984a), implications for reading instruction from the research on teacher and school effectiveness, Journal of Reading, 28, 109-115; and Baumann, J. F. (press-a), The direct instruction of main idea comprehension ability, in J. F. Baumann (Ed.), Teaching main idea comprehension, Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Direct Instruction in Reading: What Is It?

The term direct instruction has several definitions and interpretations. Direct instruction was first popularized by way of the University of Oregon Direct Instruction Model as an effective way to teach disadvantaged children (Becker, 1977; Becker & Carnine, 1980). This original direct instruction model "emphasizes small-group, face-to-face instruction by a teacher using carefully sequenced, daily lessons in reading, arithmetic, and language" (Becker, 1977, p. 428). This direct instruction approach was subsequently marketed by Science Research Associates as the familiar DISTAR programs (Engelmann & Bruner, 1969). What is most distinctive about the original direct instruction model is the highly structured, scripted lessons from which the teacher must not deviate.

> The scripts permit the selection and testing of sequences of examples that produce efficient learning if followed. Most teachers simply do not have time to find appropriate words and examples or to sequence skill hierarchies in the most efficient possible manner. When teachers phrase their own questions, they may choose terms unknown to lower-performing children or may include unnecessary verbiage. In choosing examples, moreover, they may teach incorrect rules. (Becker, 1977, p. 430)

In this conception of direct instruction, the teacher's role is rather limited. Altering the scripted lessons or any other modifications of the direct instruction methods and materials are not allowed. In effect, the teacher simply delivers the lesson and engages in very little, if any, instructional decision-making.

Other researchers and theorists, however, began to use the term direct instruction in a somewhat different manner, emphasizing the child and teacher more, rather than the design of instruction or the method of delivery, as was the case with the University of Oregon model. Rosenshine (1979) typified direct instruction in a manner similar to that of Becker (1977) and Becker and Carnine (1980), although he deemphasized the regimented, scripted lessons and looked more toward teacher behaviors associated with student achievement. Berliner (1981) defined direct instruction as consisting of a conflux of conditions and teacher behaviors that have been associated with effective classroom instruction, such as content coverage, opportunity to learn, academic engaged time, allocated time, success rate, and the like. Similarly, Duffy and Roehler (1982) placed the emphasis on teacher variables, not task variables: "Direct instruction means an academic focus, precise sequencing of content, high pupil engagement, careful teacher monitoring and specific corrective feedback to students" (p. 35). Baumann (1983) reinforced the notion that at the real heart of direct instruction lies the teacher:

> In direct instruction, the teacher, in a face-to-face, reasonably formal manner, tells, shows, models, demonstrates, teaches the skill to be learned. The key word here is teacher, for it is the teacher who is in command of the learning situation and leads the lesson, as opposed to having instruction "directed" by a worksheet, kit, learning center, or workbook. (p. 287)

Therefore, it is the teacher behavior aspect of classroom instruction that underpins the instructional strategy presented in this paper. In the following section, the research findings on teacher effectiveness (i.e., teacher behaviors) that support this teacher-directiveness approach are discussed.

Teacher Effectiveness and Direct Instruction

Much has been learned about teacher behaviors that discriminate successful teachers from less successful teachers. Many of the teacher effect studies have been correlational (e.g., Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, and Dishaw, 1980) in which certain teacher behaviors and conditions of the instructional environment have been linked to high student achievement. Other studies have been experimental (e.g., Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979) in which students of teachers trained to adopt effective teacher behaviors (as identified by correlational studies) have made gains greater than students of teachers not so trained. A comprehensive review of this large body teacher effectiveness research is beyond the scope of this paper; interested readers are referred to one of several reviews of this literature (Baumann, 1984a; Berliner, 1981; Brophy & Good, in press; Duffy, 1981, 1982; Good, 1979, 1983; Rosenshine, 1976; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1984; Winograd & Hare, in press). What follows, however, is a selective review of the aspects of teacher effectiveness research that are germane to the subsequent discussion of the teacher-directiveness paradigm for teaching reading comprehension skills.

Underlying Assumptions

Effective teachers consistently make two assumptions about teaching and learning. First, it is assumed that the school (faculty and administrators) is primarily responsible for student achievement (Brophy & Evertson, 1974, 1976; Hoffman & Rutherford, 1984; Samuels, 1981; Venezky & Winfield, 1979). In other words, teachers and principals do not engage in academic "buck-passing." Rather, they accept the social, economic, and political realities of their situation and work within the constraints present. Therefore, poverty, limited resources, family difficulties, etc. are not used as excuses for failure to learn. Second, effective teachers expect that their students will learn (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1974, 1976; McDonald & Elias, 1976; Rutter, Maughan, Martimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). As Duffy (1982) stated, "When teachers believe that students can learn, they do learn" (p. 365). In effect, these two assumptions reflect teacher confidence--confidence in their ability to teach and in students' ability to learn (Brophy, 1979).

Goals and Objectives

When teachers have clearly-formulated instructional objectives, and when they are able to effectively communicate them to children, learning is enhanced (Anderson et al., 1979; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Tikunoff, Berliner, & Rist, 1975). In turn, effective instruction is typified by children who also know what they are about to learn and why it is important; there is little or no confusion on the part of teachers and students in effective classrooms about what the academic goals are.

Allocated Time

In effective reading programs, enough time is allocated for instruction; that is, there is a direct relationship between the length of the reading period and reading achievement (Fisher et al., 1980; Berliner, 1981). Therefore, it would be safe to predict that if Teacher A had a 40-minute reading period daily and Teacher B had a 75-minute period, Teacher B's students would outperform those of Teacher A. Obviously, there are other factors that affect reading achievement beyond simple time allocation (see the following items), but by setting aside a reasonable amount of time for reading instruction, students are afforded a sufficient opportunity to learn.

Academic Engaged Time

A factor with a stronger relationship to student achievement than time allocation alone is academic engaged time (Berliner, 1981; Fisher et al., 1980; Rosenshine & Berliner, 1978). Academic engaged time is the amount of allocated time that students are attending to (i.e., engaged in) reading instruction, or more simply stated, "time on task." When students are academically engaged, they pay attention to and participate in the instructional task at hand (e.g., skill instruction by the teacher, oral or silent reading, doing a workbook page, working in a reading kit, reading independently), as opposed to nonacademic engagement which would be transition times, talking, disciplining, and the like.

Academic Emphasis

Teachers who ran their classrooms in a task-oriented or businesslike manner were more effective than teachers who were less formal and student-oriented (Solomon & Kendall, 1979; Stallings, Cory, Fairweather, & Needles, 1977; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974; Stallings, Needles, & Stayrook, 1979). An environment with an academic emphasis was typified by teachers who lead lessons themselves (as opposed to self-teaching), used time efficiently, did not digress from the lesson at hand, held students accountable for classroom work and homework, had instructional materials ready, provided substantive feedback to students about their performance, and encouraged students to employ good work habits. Conversely, in classes with less of an academic emphasis, teachers allowed much more unstructured group sharing time and employed many activities that involved arts, crafts, games, puzzles, and toys.

Teacher-Led Instruction

Teachers with the highest achievement gains are those who select and direct classroom activities themselves (Soar, 1973; Stallings et al., 1977; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974; Solomon & Kendall, 1979). Teachers who placed the student as the center of attention, organized learning around student-generated problems, and joined in and participated in student activities were less effective. In addition, student choice of activities has been negatively related to achievement. As Rosenshine and Stevens (1984) note:

> Classrooms in which students chose their own activities, followed their own interests, were responsible for class planning, and were not teacher dependent were also the classrooms which were characterized by rowdiness, shouting, noise, and disorderliness. In addition, these factors of permissiveness, spontaneity, and lack of control were negatively related not only to achievement gain, but also to growth in creativity, inquiry, writing ability, and self-esteem for the students in those classrooms. (pp. 746-747)

High Success Rates

Effective teachers are those who enable their students to be regularly successful (Anderson et al., 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Fisher et al., 1980). Berliner (1981) defines high success as "the student understands the task and makes only occasional careless errors" (p. 209). For example, high success would mean that students respond to most questions correctly, read aloud with minimal miscues, and get a high proportion of items correct on written assignments. In other words, the psychologically-intuitive notion that "success breeds success" has empirical support. The importance of high success rates, however, does not mean that students should not be challenged or that students do not learn from errors ("Common sense suggests that too high a rate of 'high success' work would be deleterious," Berliner, 1981, p. 211); instead, it merely means that regular failure (i.e., low success rates) discourages or interferes with learning.

Effective Managers

Not surprisingly, teachers who are effective managers are effective in teaching children reading skills (Anderson et al., 1979; Brophy & Good, in press; Emmer et al., 1980; Duffy, 1981, 1982). Management behaviors linked to effective reading instruction include thorough, advanced preparation by the teacher, a brisk pace of instruction, minimal transition time, the installation of unambiguous rules and procedures, and an ability to prevent misbehavior (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1982).

Teacher Monitoring

Teacher monitoring also has been shown to be directly related to student achievement (Anderson et al., 1979; Brophy & Good, in press; Emmer et al., 1980). Monitoring involves teachers' ability to check students' understanding, to provide corrective feedback, to reteach when necessary, and to insure the completion of assigned work. Monitoring is obviously closely tied to engagement and management, for these are the teachers who create more opportunities for students to learn by organizing themselves and their classrooms to enhance efficiency and minimize wasted time (Anderson et al., 1982).

Large or Small Group Instruction

Although one-to-one instruction is the most effective organizational pattern (Smith & Glass, 1980), given the impracticality of much one-to-one instruction in classrooms of 20-30 students, the research indicates that traditional, large or small group instruction is more effective than highly "individualized" instruction in which students are expected to learn by themselves (Fisher et al., 1980; Kean, Summers, Raivetz, & Farber, 1979; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974). When reviewing this literature, Rosenshine and Stevens (1984) noted, "when students worked in groups under adult supervision, correlations with achievement were positive and often significant, but when small groups met without an adult, correlations between this pattern and achievement were negative and often significant" (p. 748). Although the research provides no definitive answer to the question of the relative merits of large versus small group instruction (Brophy & Good, in press), small group instruction is probably necessary for teaching reading, especially in highly heterogeneous classes (Anderson et al., 1982; Brophy & Good, in press). In other words, when students work in homogeneous groups (usually achievement level groups), achievement is greater than when students are working independently on learning packets or centers (Brophy & Good, in press). This does not mean

that individual differences should not be taken into consideration. Whole class or large group instruction in which each student, regardless of instructional level, must use the same materials is unwise. But when teachers group on the basis of achievement level and assign appropriate instructional materials, students increase their reading ability (Anderson et al., 1982).

Classroom Atmosphere

Given all the emphasis on academic focus, teacher-directed instruction, effective management, strict monitoring, and the like, one might be left with the impression that effective teachers run classrooms like a Marine drill sergeant, in which the climate is authoritarian, discipline is harsh, rules are unbending, and punishment is administered arbitrarily. Quite to the contrary, effective classrooms have been found to be warm, cooperative, "convivial" environments (Anderson et al., 1979; Berliner & Rosenshine, 1977; Brophy & Evertson, 1974; Emmer et al., 1980). Teachers were in charge in effective classrooms, no doubt, and there was little tolerance for nonacademic activities, but these teachers also had a sense of humor, administered praise, and communicated to children a sincere feeling of caring. In effect, these classrooms were happy places where students felt secure and comfortable.

A Teacher-Directiveness Instructional Paradigm for Teaching Reading Comprehension Skills

Most of the teacher behaviors just described have been clustered under the rubric direct instruction (Baumann, 1983; Berliner, 1981; Berliner & Rosenshine, 1977; Duffy, 1981, 1982; Rosenshine, 1976). In this global sense, when direct instruction occurs, enough time is allocated to reading instruction, teachers accept responsibility for student achievement, and they expect that their students will learn. Teachers understand the objectives for their lessons and are able to communicate them effectively to their students. The academic atmosphere is business-like and serious but, at the same time, is nonthreatening, warm, and convivial. The teacher selects the instructional activities and directs the lessons; instruction is not administered by a workbook, learning center, textbook, or another student. Instruction usually occurs in small or large groups, students succeed more often than not, and students are on task a high proportion of the time. The teacher is well prepared, is able to prevent misbehavior, checks students' understanding, provides corrective feedback, and reteaches when necessary. But most important, the teacher is in command of the learning situation by showing, telling, demonstrating, modeling, teaching the skill to be learned.

The five step teacher-directiveness instructional paradigm that follows (Baumann, 1983) is built upon this large corpus of research on teacher effectiveness. The five steps in the paradigm are Introduction, Example, Direct Instruction, Teacher-Directed Application, and Independent Practice, and each is explicated in the following sections. Transcripts of actual lessons or prototype lessons can be found in any of the following publications: Baumann, 1983, 1984b, in press-a, in press-b; Baumann and Stevenson, in press.

Introduction

In this step, students are provided a purpose for the ensuing lesson, and they are told why the acquisition of the skill will help them become better readers. In effect, the introduction is simply a structured overview, so the students have a clear understanding of the content and purpose of the lesson that follows. The introduction is built upon the teacher effectiveness findings related to "underlying assumptions" and "goals and objectives" (see previous review).

Example

The example is an extension of the introduction. In this step, a section of text that contains an example of the skill to be taught is shown to the students. This helps the students understand more fully what they will learn about. The example demonstrates how this relationship or convention exists in written text and how the ability to understand the relationship or convention will help students comprehend better what they read. Like the introduction, the example builds upon what is known about "underlying assumptions," "goals and objectives," and "academic emphasis."

Direct Instruction

In direct instruction, the teacher is actively engaged in showing, telling, modeling, demonstrating the skill to be learned. As in the introduction and example, the teacher is leading the lesson during direct instruction. The students are actively involved by responding to questions and working out the comprehension of text, but the teacher is in charge. That is, the primary responsibility for learning rests with the teacher; shared pupil-teacher responsibility and full pupil responsibility for learning come in following steps (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). Heuristics are an important part of direct instruction; they provide students with some structure or method to use when they apply independently the skill in the future. In addition, students are required to compose answers whenever possible in direct instruction (and in following steps), for it is known that when students must generate responses, learning is greater than when they are simply required to recognize or identify answers (Bridge, Belmore, Moskow, Cohen, & Matthews, 1984; Doctrow, Wittrock, & Marks, 1978; Taylor & Berkowitz, 1980). Direct instruction is founded upon the teacher effectiveness findings related to "academic emphasis," "academic engaged time," "teacher-directed instruction," "high success rates," "effective management," and "small group instruction."

Teacher-Directed Application

In this step, the responsibility for skill acquisition begins to shift to the student (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). In teacher-directed application, the teacher still initiates the activities, but the students are required to "puzzle out" texts which contain the targeted skill under the supervision of the teacher. In other words, the teacher is present for guidance and feedback, but the students are forced to apply the skill taught previously. This enables the teacher to monitor students' success in skill acquisition so that reteaching can occur if necessary. Research related to "academic emphasis," "teacher-directed instruction," "effective management," and "teacher monitoring" underpin this step.

Independent Practice

In the final step, the transition from full teacher responsibility for learning, to shared pupil/teacher responsibility, to full student responsibility is complete (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). In independent practice, students are provided exercises that consist of materials not used in instruction or application and which require them to exercise the skill independently. The use of passage-length texts and generative responses are also desirable characteristics of this step. Teacher effectiveness research provides considerable evidence of the need for substantial amounts of independent practice after instruction has occured (e.g., Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Fisher et al., 1980; Stallings et al., 1977; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974). In addition, research related to "underlying assumptions," "allocated time," "academic engaged time," and "teacher monitoring" relate to this step.

Empirical Support for a Teacher-Directiveness Instructional Paradigm

There is ample evidence to support the effectiveness of direct instruction approaches to teaching reading comprehension skills (see a review by Winograd & Hare, in press). For example, Hansen (1981) and Hansen and Pearson (1983) were effective in teaching children to increase markedly their inferential comprehension skill; Raphael and Pearson (1982) and Raphael and McKinney (1983) reported positive effects of metacognitive training on children's question/answering strategies; Reis and Spekman (1983) were successful in training upper-grade poor comprehenders in the use of comprehension monitoring strategies; Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983) enhanced children's comprehension of stories by direct instruction on narrative structure; Adams, Carnine, and Gersten (1982) were successful in teaching fifth-grade students a study skills strategy for reading content area texts; Tharp (1982) reported consistently higher levels of reading comprehension achievement in a longitudinal study involving educationally high-risk, Polynesian-Hawaiian primary-grade children who received massed, active comprehension instruction when compared to children who experienced a more traditional decoding-focused program; Patching, Kameenui, Carnine, Gersten, and Colvin (1983) trained fifth-grade students in critical reading comprehension skills (faulty generalization, false causality, and invalid testimonial) and found that students who received a systematic, direct instruction approach outperformed comparable students who received a workbook-with-corrective-feedback approach and controls; Taylor and Beach (1984) and Hare and Borchardt (1984) taught secondary students to construct summaries for expository textbook selections; and Garner, Hare, Alexander, Haynes, and Winograd (1984) were successful in teaching upper-elementary and middle-school students to employ text look-backs as an aid to reading comprehension.

The teacher-directiveness paradigm presented in this paper was used successfully in two instructional studies: one study in which sixth grade students were taught to comprehend several main idea comprehension skills, and a second study in which third-grade students were taught to comprehend a variety of anaphoric relationships (word referents).

Study 1: Teaching Main Idea Comprehension (Baumann, 1984)

Method. Sixty-six, sixth grade students from a rural midwestern community were blocked on achievement (according to a standardized reading comprehension test) and placed into High, Middle, and Low achievement level groups. Students were randomly assigned, within blocks, to one of three treatments: a Strategy, Basal, or Control group. Strategy group subjects received intensive, direct instruction in main idea skills according to the teacher-directiveness paradigm. Main idea skills involved explicit and implicit main ideas at both the paragraph and passage levels, and the construction of hierarchical main idea outlines for passages. Basal group subjects were taught main idea lessons from a basal reader series different from the one all students were using in their sixth-grade classes. Control group students were administered a series of unrelated vocabulary development activities.

A 3 (treatment) by 3 (achievement level) posttest-only control group design was employed. Eight lessons were taught to all groups, and the experimenter administered all instruction. Five dependent measures resulted in nine different scores that assessed students' ability to comprehend explicit and implicit main ideas in paragraph and passage length texts.

Results. A MANOVA revealed a significant main effect for treatment [$F(10, 106) = 6.979$, $p < .001$] and achievement level [$F(10, 106) = 5.238$, $p < .001$]; the treatment by achievement level interaction did not attain statistical significance. Appropriate univariate and post hoc analyses revealed that (1) the Strategy group outperformed both the Basal and Control groups in ability to recognize explicit and implicit paragraph main ideas, recognize details that support main ideas, recognize explicit and implicit passage main ideas, and compose paragraph and passage main ideas for a main idea outline, and (2) the Basal group outperformed the Control group only in ability to recognize explicit paragraph main ideas.

Study 2: Teaching Anaphora Comprehension (Baumann, in press-b)

Method. Sixty, third-grade students from a rural midwestern community were assigned randomly to one of three treatments: a Strategy, Basal, or Control. The Strategy group students were administered a series of lessons on anaphora comprehension according to the teacher-directiveness paradigm. Anaphora forms taught included personal and possessive pronoun, demonstrative, locative, temporal, arithmetic, synonymous, and verbal anaphora. Basal group subjects were taught a series of lessons on word referents from a basal reader series different from the one all students were using in their third-grade classrooms. The Control group received no additional instruction on anaphora and simply participated in the regularly-scheduled language arts instruction administered by one of the third-grade teachers.

A pretest-posttest control group design was employed. The pretest consisted of find-the-antecedent exercises and anaphora-specific wh questions for narrative and expository texts. Four different posttests probed students' ability to find antecedents for specified anaphoric terms and to answer anaphora-specific wh questions after reading short, contrived texts and longer, naturally-occurring narrative and expository selections. Nine experimenter-taught lessons were administered to the Strategy and Basal groups.

Results. A MANCOVA, in which the total pretest score was the covariate, was significant [F, 3,104, = 7.229, $p < .001$]. Planned contrasts for individual posttests revealed that any intervention was superior to no instruction (Strategy & Basal vs. 2 · Control) for each posttest. Likewise, contrasts comparing the intervention approaches (Strategy vs. Basal) were significant, favoring the Strategy treatment, for all posttests.

Conclusion

The results of these two studies indicate that a teacher-directiveness approach to instruction is more effective in teaching selected reading comprehension skills than basal reader instruction. Specifically, sixth grade students were taught to comprehend main ideas and third grade students were taught to associate referents with their antecedents more effectively when the instruction was intensive, systematic, and direct when compared to traditional basal reader instruction.

One possible explanation for the group differences, of course, is that the basal lessons contained little or no direct instruction; however, they were not found to be devoid of direct instruction. In fact, contrary to Durkin's (1981) claim that basal materials provide little actual instruction in comprehension skills, the main idea and anaphora lessons were reasonably strong in this area. Where then did the breakdown occur? It is believed that it was in the area of application and transfer. Unlike the teacher-directiveness paradigm that provided substantial amounts of teacher-directed application and independent practice using natural, passage-length texts, the basal materials failed to provide much guided practice, and most instructional texts were short and contrived. It is possible, therefore, that the basal group students grasped the basic main idea and anaphora skills, but failed to fully assimilate these abilities because application and transfer opportunities were sparse.

Additional research using the teacher-directiveness paradigm and other direct instruction approaches is needed. It remains to be seen if other comprehension skills can be taught effectively using the teacher-directiveness paradigm, and experimentation with other reading skills (e.g., vocabulary, decoding) must occur. Training studies (similar in design to that of Anderson et al., 1979) also need to be conducted, in which students' reading achievement in classrooms lead by teachers trained in teacher-directiveness techniques is compared to students in similar classes led by untrained teachers. Such experiments are currently underway.

References

Adams, A., Carnine, D., & Gersten, R. (1982). Instructional strategies for studying content area texts in the intermediate grades. Reading Research Quarterly, 18, 27-55.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 79, 193-223.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. (1982). Principles of small-group instruction in elementary reading. (Occasional Paper No. 58). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Baumann, J. F. (1983). A generic comprehension instructional strategy. Reading World, 22, 284-294.

Baumann, J. F. (1984a). Implications for reading instruction from the research on teacher and school effectiveness. Journal of Reading, 28, 109-115.

Baumann, J. F. (1984b). The effectiveness of a direct instruction paradigm for teaching main idea comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 93-115.

Baumann, J. F. (in press-a). The direct instruction of main idea comprehension ability. In J. F. Baumann (Ed.), Teaching main idea comprehension, Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Baumann, J. F. (in press-b). Teaching third grade students to comprehend anaphoric relationships: The application of a direct instruction model. Reading Research Quarterly.

Baumann, J. F., & Stevenson, J. A. (in press). Teaching students to comprehend anaphoric relationships. In J. W. Irwin (Ed.), Understanding and teaching cohesion comprehension. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Becker, W. C. (1977). Teaching reading and language to the disadvantaged--what we have learned from the research. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 518-543.

Becker, W. C., & Carnine, D. W. (1980). Direct instruction: An effective approach to educational intervention with the disadvantaged and low performers. In B. B. Lahey and A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology (Vol. 3, pp. 429-473). New York: Plenum.

Berliner, D. C. (1981). Academic learning time and reading achievement. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews (pp. 203-226). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Berliner, D. C., & Rosenshine, B. V. (1977). The acquisition of knowledge in the classroom. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, and W. E. Montague (Eds.), Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge (pp. 375-396). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bridge, C. A., Belmore, S. M., Moskow, S. P., Cohen, S. S., & Matthews, P. D. (1984). Topicalization and memory for main ideas in prose. Journal of Reading Behavior, 16, 61-80.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. (Occasional Paper No. 17). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Brophy, J. (1979). Teacher behavior and student learning. Educational Leadership, 37, 33-38.

Brophy, J. & Evertson, C. M. (1974). Process-product correlations in the Texas teacher effectiveness study: Final report. (Report No. 4004). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Brophy, J. & Evertson, C. M. (1976). Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (in press). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Third handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Doctrow, M., Wittrock, M. C., & Marks, C. (1978). Generative processes in reading comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 109-118.

Duffy, G. G. (1981). Teacher effectiveness research: Implications for the reading profession. In M. L. Kamil (Ed.), Directions in reading: Research and instruction, Thirtieth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 113-136). Washington, D. C.: National Reading Conference.

Duffy, G. G. (1982). Fighting off the alligators: What research in real classrooms has to say about reading instruction. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14, 357-373.

Duffy, G. G., & Roehler, L. F. (1982). Direct instruction of comprehension: What does it really mean? Reading Horizons, 23, 35-40.

Durkin, D. D. (1978-79). What classroom observations reveal about reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 481-533.

Durkin, D. D. (1981). Reading comprehension instruction in five basal reader series. Reading Reserach Quarterly, 16, 515-544.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 80, 219-231.

Engelmann, S., & Bruner, E. D. (1969). DISTAR reading: An instructional system. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Fisher, C. W., Berliner, D. C., Filby, N. N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L. S., & Dishaw, M. M. (1980). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education.

Fitzgerald, J., & Speigel, D. L. (1983). Enhancing children's reading comprehension through instruction in narrative structure. Journal of Reading Behavior, 15, 19-36.

Garner, R., Hare, V. C., Alexander, P., Haynes, J., & Winograd, P. (1984). Inducing use of a text lookback strategy among unsuccessful readers. American Educational Research Journal, 21. 789-798.

Good, T. L. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-64.

Good, T. L. (1983). Research on classroom teaching. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Hansen, J. (1981). The effects of inference training and practice on young children's reading comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 16, 391-417.

Hansen, J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). An instructional study: Improving the inferential comprehension of fourth grade good and poor readers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 79, 821-829.

Hare, V. C., & Borchardt, K. M. (1984). Direct instruction of summarization skills. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 62-78.

Hoffman, J. V., & Rutherford, W. L. (1984). Effective reading programs: A critical review of outlier studies. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 79-91.

McDonald, F. J., & Elias, P. (1976). The effects of teaching performance on pupil learning: Final report, volume 1, beginning teacher evaluation study, phase II, 1974-1976. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Patching, W., Kameenui, E., Carnine, D., Gersten, R., & Colvin, G. (1983). Direct instruction in critical reading skills. Reading Research Quarterly, 18, 406-418.

Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8, 317-344.

Raphael, T., & McKinney, J. (1983). An examination of fifth- and eighth-grade children's question-answering behavior: An instructional study in megacognition. Journal of Reading Behavior, 15, 67-86.

Raphael, T., & Pearson, P. D. (1982). The effect of metacognitive training on children's question-answering behavior (Technical Report No. 238). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Reis, R., & Spekman, N. J. (1983). The detection of reader-based versus text-based inconsistencies and the effects of direct training of comprehension monitoring among upper-grade poor comprehenders. Journal of Reading Behavior, 15, 49-60.

Rosenshine, B. (1976). Classroom instruction. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), The psychology of teaching methods, 75th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rosenshine, B. V. (1979). Content, time, and direct instruction. In H. Walberg and P. Peterson (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Rosenshine, B. V., & Berliner, D. C. (1978). Academic engaged time. British Journal of Teacher Education, 4, 3-16.

Rosenshine, B. V., & Stevens, R. (1984). Classroom instruction in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research, 745-798. New York: Longman.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Martimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Samuels, S. J. (1981). Characteristics of exemplary reading programs. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews, 255-273. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1980). Meta-analysis of research on class size and its relation to attitudes and instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 17, 419-434.

Soar, R. S. (1973). Follow-through classroom process measurement and pupil growth (1970-71): Final report. Gainesville, FL: College of Education, University of Florida.

Solomon, D., & Kendall, A. J. (1979). Children in classrooms. New York: Praeger.

Stallings, J., Cory, R., Fairweather, J., & Needles, M. (1977). Early childhood education classroom evaluation. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute.

Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D. (1974). Follow through classroom observation evaluation 1972-1973. (Project URU-7370). Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, Stanford University.

Stallings, J., Needles, M., & Stayrook, N. (1979). How to change the process of teaching basic reading skills in secondary schools. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Taylor, B. M., & Beach, R. W., (1984). The effects of text structure instruction on middle-grade students' comprehension and production of expository text. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 134-146.

Taylor, B. M., & Berkowitz, S. (1980). Facilitating children's comprehension of content material. In M. L. Kamil and A. J. Moe (Eds.), Perspectives in reading research and instruction, Twenty-ninth yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 64-68. Clemson, SC: National Reading Conference.

Tharp, R. G. (1982). The effective instruction of comprehension: Results and description of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 507-527.

Tikunoff, W., Berliner, D. C., & Rist, R. C. (1975). An ethnographic study of the forty classrooms of the beginning teacher evaluation study known sample. (Technical Report No. 75-10-5). San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Venezky, R. L., & Winfield, L. (1979). Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading. (Technical Report No. 1). Newark, DE: Department of Educational Studies, University of Delaware.

Winograd, P., & Have, V. C. (in press). Direct instruction of reading comprehension strategies: The role of teacher explanation. In E. Goetz, P. Alexander, and C. Weinstein (Eds.), Learning and study strategies: Issues in assessment, instruction, and evaluation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.